

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application. Claims 31-45 are new. Of the remaining claims, claims 29 and 30 have been withdrawn, and claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-28 have been rejected. In the outstanding non-final office action, claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-28 have been rejected under the doctrine of nonobviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of the parent of the present application, U.S. Patent 6,718,310. In order to obviate this rejection, we are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer.

Claims 1-10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being directed to subject matter that would have been obvious from U.S. Patent No. 6,405,175 (Ng) in combination with the document cited in the office action as "892 U". Claims 15, 17-20, and 22-24 similarly stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being directed to subject matter that would have been obvious from Ng in combination with 892 U and Hatamaka. The Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider the application and to withdraw the rejections in view of the following remarks.

Before discussing rejections, applicants' undersigned attorney would like to acknowledge the Examiner's request on pages 2-3 of the office action, which indicates that the Examiner is asking the applicant to provide copies of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 22, 2004. We have submitted herewith copies of the documents that we were able to locate. Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in locating the "Derwent" articles, as they appear to have been obtained from the Internet and are no longer available.

Applicants' undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Allen and his supervisor, Mr. Garp, for their courtesy in participating in a telephonic interview on March 13, 2006. During the interview, applicants' attorney discussed with the Examiner a draft of the above amendment, and provided an overview of the claimed subject matter with reference to the discussion in the Background and Summary sections of applicants' specification. Applicants' attorney agreed to help define the term "prime motivator", since this relates to an aspect of the claimed invention and is used in many of the claims. Accordingly, in claim 1, we have proposed to add the statement, "wherein said current prime motivator product has been identified by the system as the product that caused the requestor to initiate the shopping

session.” Support for this language can be found in the first two paragraphs of the “Detailed Description” section of the specification.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and to withdraw the rejections. The prior art of record lacks any teaching or suggestion of the systems and methods recited in applicants’ claims, including the identification of “prime motivator” product that has been determined to be likely to have caused a purchaser of the product to have initiated the on-line shopping session.

Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns, or feel that the instant response is insufficient to place the claims in allowable condition, he is respectfully invited to call applicants’ attorney at 206.332.1384.

Conclusion

A Notice of Allowance for claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-28, and 31-45 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 34,734

Date: May 15, 2006

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439